

REMARKS

The pending independent claims are method claim 1, method claim 18, software claim 21, terminal claim 24, and terminal claim 27. All independent and dependent claims have been rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) from *Robotham* (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0015042) in view of *Kendall* (U.S. Patent Application 2005/0193053). The claims are now amended without prejudice, and without introducing any new matter. The claim amendments include minor grammatical amendments, as well as amendments to overcome the rejections and expedite prosecution of the application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 11, 21, 23, 24, and 26 are rejected due to non-statutory subject matter. These claims are now amended to overcome that rejection, for example by stating that the computer-readable medium stores a computer-executable code which when executed performs the enumerated functions. Also, claim 24 is a means-plus-function claim that is now amended in a way that parallels the language of non-mean-plus-function claim 27.

Amended Claims are Not Disclosed or Suggested by the Cited References

The present independent claims are now amended without prejudice to further distinguish from the cited references, which should expedite prosecution. All of the amendments are fully supported by the specification, and introduce no new matter. Claim 1 is now amended primarily to explain that, when a user decides to stop viewing the content (e.g. because the user wants to go to another web site), the user will be asked whether to save the rendering mode that the user most recently selected. If the user answers affirmatively, then a correlation of rendering mode to origin is stored, and this correlation information is used later to access a revised version of the content in the stored rendering mode. This is supported, for example, at page 4, lines 8-14 of the application as originally filed, where it is described that the software can inquire (when the user closes a document) whether to save the changed rendering mode that is correlated to the origin of the content.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited *Kendall* reference does not disclose anything like this feature. See, for example, Figure 7 of *Kendall*, which shows that additional preferences are received

53, and are then automatically stored 54, without any inquiry to the user about whether the user wants the additional preferences to be stored. This is a substantial difference from the present claimed invention, because the present invention allows a user to experiment with various different rendering modes after opening content in a first rendering mode, while allowing the user to close the content without affecting the first rendering mode that will be used when the content is visited again in the future.

Likewise, the cited *Robotham* reference does not teach or suggest the features of amended claim 1. For example, the cited paragraph 502 of *Robotham* does not suggest the present claimed inquiry to the user when the user decides to close the content (asking the user whether the rendering mode should be saved or not). Likewise, in the cited paragraph 430, there is no suggestion to send an inquiry to the user after the user decides to close the content, much less an inquiry about whether to save the current rendering mode.

CONCLUSION

The arguments presented above regarding claim 1 apply equally to the other independent claims. Because the cited reference does not teach or suggest critical elements of the present amended independent claims, it is respectfully submitted that these present claims are novel and patentable. Early allowance of the pending independent claims and the claims depending therefrom is consequently requested. Applicant would be grateful if the Examiner would please contact Applicant's attorney by telephone if the Examiner detects anything in the present response that might hinder a speedy allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 25 March 2008

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER
SLUY'S & ADOLPHSON LLP
Building Five, Bradford Green
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955

Andrew T. Hyman
Andrew T. Hyman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,858